DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 020 JC 930 050

AUTHOR Ratliffe, Sharon A.
TITLE Annual Survey Provides Professional Development Profiles.
INSTITUTION Golden West Coll., Huntington Beach, Calif.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Administrators; Administrator Selection; Advisory Committees; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Educational Research; *Faculty Development; Professional Development; School Surveys; *Staff Development; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

In September 1992, a mail survey was conducted of staff development coordinators (SDC's) at California community colleges. A total of 56 colleges returned usable surveys. Where appropriate, survey results were compared with findings from 1990 and 1991 surveys of SDC's. Results from the 1992 survey included the following: (1) between 1990 and 1992, SDC's responsibilities steadily increased, while clerical support and reassigned time remained the same or decreased; (2) 38% of the respondents were new to the position of SDC; (3) over the 3-year period, the percentage of SDC's classified as administrators increased from 20% to 29%; (4) 73% of the respondents indicated that there was no change in reassigned time from the previous year; (5) approximately 20% of the respondents reported having no clerical support, up 2% from 1991; (6) 80% of the SDC's reported being responsible for writing the Human Development Resource Plan, while 88% were responsible for evaluating all staff development activities, both representing increases from the previous year; (7) the average Staff Development Advisory Committee (SDAC) included 12 members, and approximately one-third of SDAC's were chaired by the SDC; (8) there was a steady trend across the 3-year period of assigning dollar amounts of development funds by employee category (46% in 1992), while 50% continue to base funding on annual needs assessments; and (9) respondents reported that classified workshops and off-campus extended workshops were the most successful development activities. Data tables and the survey instrument are included. (PAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353020

Annual Survey Provides

Professional Development Profiles

by

Sharon A. Ratliffe

Golden West College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. A. Ratliffe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 930 050

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANNUAL SURVEY PROVIDES PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROFILES

By Sharon A. Ratliffe, Golden West College

Over half of the California Community Colleges responded to the third annual staff development survey conducted by mail in September, 1992. While in 1990 (N = 30), the sample included only colleges in the southern region of 4C/SD, the 1991 (N = 53) and 1992 (N = 56) studies were expanded statewide by including all community colleges using a mailing list provided by the State Chancellor's Office, Human Development Division.

The following summary of results provides profiles of the position of staff development coordinator, the staff development advisory committee, and professional development activities. Trends are reported where they seem to exist over the three year period.

The Staff Development Coordinator

In general, a comparison of the data collected over the three-year period seems to indicate that while reassigned time and clerical support has remained the same or decreased, the responsibilities of the staff development coordinator seem to be on a slow but steady increase.

Years in the Position. Approximately one-fifth less coordinators are currently in their first year as compared with two years ago (1990). However, the 38% who are currently new to the position represent an increase of 7% over last year (1991). [Question 1]

Length of Assignment. There has been little change in the responses over the three-year period. Approximately two-fifths indicate that their term is indefinite, one-third have two year terms, and one-fifth serve for one-year. [Question 38]

Method of Selection: Over the three-year period, approximately one-fifth report that the coordinator was recruited, one-third indicated that the position was advertised and interested persons applied, one-third note that interviews were part of the process, and about one-tenth reported that a combination of these methods were used. There has been a steady increase in those indicating that interviews are part of the process (19% to 26% to 30%). The percent of institutions who assign the coordination responsibility has changed significantly over the three-year period (8% to 23% to 13%). [Question 37]

Employee Classification. There has been a steady increase in the percent of coordinators who are administrators (from 20% to 23% to 29%). While compared with 1991,there has also been a 6% increase in the faculty who are coordinators in 1992, there was a significant decrease in faculty coordinators from 1990 (70%) to 1991 (51%). [Question 4]

Reassigned Time. There is little change from 1991 in the amount of reassigned time reported in 1992. Those reporting 41 to 100% reassigned time have decreased by 4% while an increase of 6% exists among those reporting 0 to 40%. 73% indicate that the amount of reassigned time is the same as last year. Across the three years, coordinators with over 81% reassigned time have increased by one-tenth; but the most significant increase was from 30 to 50% in the category of 0 to 20% reassigned time. [Questions 2 and 3]

Clerical Support. In the 1992 study, approximately one-fifth indicate no clerical support, down 7% as compared with 1990 but up 2% when compared with 1991. Another one-fifth report from 31 to 40 hours of support, down 8% from 1990. One-fourth have support for 1 to 10 hours and one-fourth report 11 to 30 hours of support. When compared with 1991,the 1992 study shows an 8% decrease in those coordinators with 11 to 20 hours of support and a 4% increase in those with 21 to 30 hours of support. [Question 35]

Role and Functions.

AB1725 Responsibilities. There is a steadily increasing trend in the number of coordinators who are responsible for each of the following activities: Scheduling (88%), setting the agenda (89%), chairing (82%) and recording and distributing minutes (77%) for the Advisory Committee; writing the Human Development Resource Plan (80%); evaluating all staff development activities (88%); and overseeing brown bag sessions and faculty forums (68%). In contrast, there appears to be a slight trend toward removing the completion of the expenditure report and tracking of the budget from the coordinator's functions since 1990 (63% to 53% to 48%). Perhaps the latter trend will continue with the simplification of the reporting procedures required by the State Chancellor's Office. [Questions 28 - 34]

Membership on Committees. Over two-thirds of the coordinators were reported as serving on committees other than the AB1725 Advisory Committee in 1992. This figure continues three-year trend (63% tc 65% to 68%). The most commonly mentioned committee assignments included flexible calendar, district staff development and academic senate; and advisory committee subcommittees for classified staff, faculty and managers. [Question 40]

Additional Responsibilities. Over two-thirds of the 1992 respondents reported that the coordinator is responsible for activities other than those funded by AB1725. There has been a small but steady increase since 1990 in the reporting of additional responsibilities (63% to 65% to 68%). The most commonly mentioned types of responsibilities include flexible calendar, liaison on college committees to provide input on staff development, and overseeing other staff development related activities and programs. [Question 39]

The Staff Development Advisory Committee

1992 findings about the Staff Development Advisory Committee that seem to stand out include the down-sizing of the committee, an increasing trend toward assigning dollar amounts by employee category, an increase in the percentage of committee chairs who are faculty and, for the first time, identification of students as members.

Committee Size and Composition. In 1992, the average committee included 12 members, identical to 1990 and down by 6 from 1991. While the 1992 committee was down-sized, the average number of persons from each employee group did not vary measurably from 1991. In 1992, the average committee included 30% classified staff (up 1% from 1991), 45% faculty (down 2% from 1991), 23% managers (down .5% from 1991), and 4 students for less than 1%. **[Question 5]**

Committee Chair. Approximately a third of the respondents report that the Staff Development Coordinator chairs the committee. While not a significant change, the percent varies over the three years (37% to 30% to 32%). As compared with 1991, the 1992 study seems to indicate that committee members who are faculty chairs have increased (23% to 32%) while chairs who are managers have decreased (26% to 21%). In the majority of instances, the chair does not vote. [Question 6]

Subcommittees. Two-thirds of the 1992 respondents (N = 37) identify a total of 24 different subcommittees. The most common include classified (17), flex day (15), faculty (13), and management (13) subcommittees. From 1 to 3 respondents reported the following additional subcommittee foci: special projects, flex/professional/instructional improvement day, travel assistance, mini-grant awards, on/off campus activities, resource center, campus relations, budget, convocation, division/discipline, safety/harassment, and student services. [Question 7]

Assignment of Funds. There is a steady trend across the three-year period toward assigning dollar amounts by employee category (37% to 38% to 46%). In 1992, approximately 50% continue to base funding on an annual needs assessment (down 7% from 1992) while about 10% assess needs bi-annually, 25% every 2 years and 10% every 3 years. [Questions 9 and 36]

Professional Development Activities

The activities on which funds are spend and those reported to be most successful seem to remain relatively consistent over the three-year period while there seems to be a significant shift in the activities identified as least successful.

Most Successful Activities. Classified workshops and off-campus extended workshops continue to be at the top of the list. Of the speakers, topics, and workshops highly recommended, Leonard Olquin speaking on diversity continues to be the most frequently identified. [Questions 41 and 43]

Least Successful Activities. In 1992, over one-fourth of the respondents chose not to respond to this question. Of those who did respond, classified workshops were listed 3 times. Listed 2 times each were teleconferences, tuition reimbursement, fitness issues, and any activity scheduled after noon on a non-flex day. These responses seem to be a major shift in the types of activities listed in 1991 which included computer workshops, flex workshops, and opening day activities. [Question 42]

The five most frequently reported activities on which AB1725 funds are spent remain the same over the three-year period; however, the rank order changes as follows:

	1990	1991	1992
Workshop/Conference Attendance	1	2	1
Facilitators/Speakers	2	1	1
Retreats/Advances	3	4	2
Flex Day Activities	4	4	3
Retraining/Upgrading	5	5	5
Research/Travel		3	4

[Questions 12 through 27]

Reported Benefits of Activities. Regardless of the employee group, the most common method of determining benefits seems to be from evaluation forms distributed after activities, on needs assessments, and by word of mouth. [Questions 44 - 51]

Faculty. Faculty report improved teaching techniques resulting both from workshops and conference/travel opportunities, increased use of computers and technology, greater sensitivity to cultural diversity, and increased collegiality with other faculty and across employee groups as benefits of participation in professional development activities.

Classified Staff. Classified Staff report increased computer and technological skills, increased customer service skills, and greater sensitivity to cultural diversity. However, the most commonly mentioned benefit seems to be a sense of empowerment within the organization, including an increase in self-esteem, connectedness with other employees and students, and the

opportunity to participate in problem-solving.

Administrators/Supervisors. Benefits to administrators and supervisors primarily are reported as benefits to the organization as a whole -- increased team work, communication, and morale in a shared governance environment. Increased leadership, communication and decision-making skills are identified as are new skills in computer usage and technology.

Students. In the 1992 study, nearly half of the respondents did not comment on benefits to students. Those who did, almost solely relied on reports of faculty and staff about benefits to students. Assumed benefits include positive changes in the campus and classroom climate, more interactive instructional strategies, and an increase in strategies sensitive to diversity. Occasionally mentioned are the use of classroom assessment techniques (CATS) combined with pre/post assessments administered to students. In addition, the involvement of students in flex day workshops, the use of Title 3 evaluation reports, and research conducted by the office of research, planning, and development are each mentioned once.

The emphasis placed on performance indicators the revised expenditure report format may serve as an impetus to develop evaluation methods that probe more deeply into the benefits of staff development in ways that directly involve students.

Question #1 Number of years in position of Staff Development Coordinator:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 yr. or less	18	60	16	31	21	38
2 to 4 years	10	34	30	56	29	51
5 yrs. or more	2	6	7	13	6	11
	30	100	53	100	56	100

Question #2 Amount of released time:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0 to 20%	9	30	25	47	28	50
21 to 40%	9	30	6	11	8	14
41 to 60%	4	13	6	11	3	6
61 to 80%	5	17	5	10	5	9
81 to 100%	1	3	8	15	8	14
No Response	2	7	3	6	4	7
	30	100	53	100	56	100

Question #3 The amount of released time is:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Same as last yr.	18	60	37	70	41	73.21
Increase	9	30	6	11	5	8.93
Decrease	1	3	2	4	5	8.93
No Response	2	7	8	15	5	8.93
	30	100	53	100	56	100

Question #4 Employee classification of Staff Development Coordinator is:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classified	1	3.33	2	3.77	1	1.78
Faculty	21	70.00	27	50.94	32	57.14
Manager	6	20.00	12	22.65	16	28.57
Other*	0		8	15.09	4	7.14
No Response	2	6.67	4	7.55	3	5.37
	30	100	53	100	56	100

*Other includes combination of faculty/manager; classified/faculty.

Question #5 The AB1725 Staff Development Advisory Committee is made up of:

	1990 N	%	1991 N	%	1992 N	%
Classified			226	28.32	190	29.59
Faculty			381	47.74	292	45.49
Manager			191	23.94	150	23.37
Student					4	.62
Other					6	.93
TOTALS:			798	100.00	642	100.00

Average Number of Committee Members by Classification:

	1990 Av. #	1991 Av. #	1992 Av. #
Classified	4	4.43	3.52
Faculty	5	7.47	5.41
Manager	3	3.75	2.78
Average Total #:	12	15.64	11.89

Question 6. The chair of the Advisory Committee is:

	1990 N	%	1991 N	%	1992 N	%
SD Coordinator	11	36.67	16	30.19	18	32.14
Member who is:						
Classified	3	10.00	5	9.43	2	3.57
Faculty	12	40.00	12	22.64	18	32.14
Manager	4	13.33	14	26.42	12	21.43
Other			4	7.55	4	7.15
No response			2	3.77	2	3.57
	30	100.00	53	100.00	56	100.00

Question 7. Subcommittees to the Advisory Committee include:

37 respondents (66.07%) identified 24 different subcommittees. The most common included Classified (17), Flex Day (15), Faculty (13), and Management (13) Subcommittees.

The following types of subcommittees were named by from 1 to 3 respondents: Special Projects, Flex/Professional/Instructional Improvement Day, Travel Assistance, Mini-Grant Awards, On/Off Campus, Resource Center, Campus Relations, Budget, Convocation, Division/Discipline, Safety/Harassment, and Student Services.

Question 8. Voting members of the Advisory Committee include:

In general, all members, classified, faculty, and management, are voting members. In the majority of instances, the chair does not vote.

Question 9. Do you assign dollar amounts by employee category:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	11	36.67	20	37.73	26	46.43
No	18	60.00	19	35.85	26	46.43
No Response	1	3.33	14	26.42	4	7.14
	30	100.00	53	100.00	56	100.00

Question 11. Who completes the expenditure report and tracks the budget:

	1990		1991		1992	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SD Coord.	19	63.00	28	52.83	27	48.21
Business Off.	11	27.00	12	22.64	13	23.21
Pres. Off.			1	1.89	1	1.79
Other			8	15.09	7	12.50
No Response			4	7.55	8	14.29
	30	100.00	53	100.00	56	100.00

Questions 12 - 27. Do you spend AB1725 funds on:
(Top 5 in order of number reporting)

	1990 Rank	1991 Rank	1992 Rank
Workshop/Conference Attendance	1	2	1
Facilitators/Speakers	2	1	1
Retreats/Advancements	3	4	2
Flex Day Activities	4	4	3
Retraining/Upgrading	5	5	5
Research/Travel		3	4

Questions 28 - 34. Are you responsible for:

	Percent "Yes" 1990	1991	1992
Scheduling Advisory Comm. Meetings	83	86	88
Setting Agenda for Meetings	86	86	89
Chairing Meetings	73	74	82
Writing/Distributing Minutes	66	73	77
Brown Bag Sessions, Faculty Forums	60	64	68
Writing Hum. Devel. Resource Plan	69	74	80
Evaluation Report of All Activities	86	79	88

Question 35. Do you have clerical support?

Hours Per Week	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Reporting		
1 - 10	29	25	25
11 - 20	14	19	11
21 - 30	0	11	16
31 - 40	29	21	21
No clerical support	28	19	21
No response		5	

Question 36. Frequency of Needs Assessment Survey:

Frequency	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Reporting		
Annually	40	57	50
Bi-annually	10	4	11
Every 2 years	30	28	24
Every 3 years	20	9	11
Needs not Assessed			

Question 37. How is the Staff Development Coordinator determined:

Method	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Reporting		
Recruited	22	21	18
Advertised/Applied	31	28	31
Interviewed/Selected	19	26	30
Assigned	8	23	13
Other*	3	2	11
No Response	17		3

*Other includes a combination of the 4 methods.

Question 38. Length of Assignment as Staff Development Coordinator:

Length	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Responding		
1 year	20	6	18
2 years	32	21	27
3 years		8	2
Indefinitely	48	47	41
No Response		7	

Question 39. Is Staff Development Coordinator responsible for activities other than those funded by AB1725:

	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Responding		
Yes	63	65	68
No	37	35	32

Most commonly mentioned types of activities include flex activities, liaison on college committees to provide input on staff development, and other staff development related workshops and programs.

Question 40. Must Staff Development Coordinator serve on other committees:

	1990	1991	1992
	Percent Responding		
Yes	53	61	64
No	47	39	36

Most typical assignments include flex committee, district staff development committee, academic senate, subcommittees for classified staff, faculty, and managers.

Question 41. Most successful activity:

Classified workshops and retreats continue to be the top items.

Question 42. Least successful activity:

In 1992, 26% chose not to respond to this question. Workshops for classified staff were listed 3 times. Listed two times were: Activities after noon on a non-flex day, teleconferences, tuition reimbursement, and fitness issues. No other activity was listed by more than one respondent. This seems to be a major shift from 1992 when computer workshops, flex workshops, and opening days were identified by several respondents.

Question 43. Speakers, topics, and workshops that are highly recommended:

Leonard Olquin speaking on cultural diversity continues to be the most frequently listed. Retreats are ranked second.

Question 52. Have you completed an annual review or evalation:

	1990 1991 1992 Percent Responding
Yes	27
No	62
No Response	11

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNCIL
FOR
STAFF DEVELOPMENT

STAFF DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS AND PROGRAM SURVEY

TO ALL STAFF DEVELOPMENT COORDINATORS:

The following survey is designed to determine what you do for both AB 1725 Staff Development and other staff development programs on your campus. This is the third year the survey has been conducted, providing longitudinal information. A summary comparing the first two years of the survey (1990-91 and 1991-92) will be found in the Summer, 1992, issue of the *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development*.

Please complete this survey to the best of your knowledge. **Return the completed survey by Friday, October 2** to Sharon Ratliffe, Golden West College, 15744 Golden West Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92647.

Results will be sent to all respondents.

Thank you!

NAME _____

TITLE _____

COLLEGE _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY_____ ZIP _____

PHONE ( )_____ EXT_____ FAX #_____

1991-92 AB 1725 ALLOCATION FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT: $_____

[Our 1990-91 allocation was: $_____]

Fill in and/or circle correct answer. You may select more than one answer where appropriate.

1. I have been the Staff Development Coordinator/Officer for:

   A. 1 year B. 2 years C. 3 years D. 4 years E. 5 or more years

2. The amount of released time I have is:

A. 0-20% B. 21-40% C. 41-60% D. 61-80% E. 81-100%

3. This amount of released time for the position of Staff Development Coordinator is:

A. The same as last year.
B. An increase over last year. [Increase of _____%.]
C. A decrease over last year. [Decrease of _____%.]

4. Employee classification of Staff Development Coordinator is:

A. Classified B. Faculty C. Manager D. Other: _____

5. Our AB 1725 Staff Development Advisory Committee is made up of:

A. Faculty [# _____] B. Classified [#_____] C. Managers [#_____]

D. Other: _____ [#_____]

6. The chair of our advisory committee is:

A. Staff Development Coordinator
A committee member who is: B. Classified C. Faculty D. Manager E. Other:_____

_____

A non-commitee member. Specify title: _____

7. There are the following sub-committees to the advisory commitee:

_____

_____

_____

8. Voting members of the advisory committee include:

A. Faculty B. Classified C. Managers D. Chair E. Other (Specify_____

_____).

9. Do you assign dollar amounts by employee category?

A. Yes B. No

10. Total employee count on our campus is: _____

A. Classified (#_____, %_____)

B. Faculty (#_____, %_____)

C. Manager (#_____, %_____)

D. Other (#_____, %_____)

11. Who completes the AB 1725 Expenditure Report for the state and tracks the budget?

A. Staff Development Coordinator
B. Campus Business Office
C. District/Chancellor/President's Office

D. Other. Specify:_____

DO YOU SPEND AB 1725 FUNDS ON:

	YES NO	Fac/Adj	Class	Admin
12. Workshop/Conference Attendance	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
13. Released time	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
14. Retreats/"Advancements"	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
15. Curriculum Development	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
16. Tuition Reimbursement	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
17. Research/Travel	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
18. Equipment/Supplies	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
19. Facilitators/Speakers	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
20. Retraining/Upgrading	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
21. Newsletter	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
22. Adjunct Mentor Program	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
23. New Employee Orientations	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
24. New Employee Mentor Program	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
25. Staff Resource Center	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
26. Flex Day Activities	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____
27. Community College Exchange Program (CCEP)	A. ___ B. ___	C. _____	D. _____	E. _____

ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR:	A. YES B. NO
28. Scheduling advisory committee meetings	A. ___ B. ___
29. Setting agenda for advisory committee meetings	A. ___ B. ___
30. Chairing advisory committee meetings	A. ___ B. ___
31. Writing and distributing minutes of advisory committee meetings	A. ___ B. ___
32. Arranging "brown bag" Sessions, faculty forums, etc.	A. ___ B. ___
33. Writing the Human Development Resource Plan	A. ___ B. ___
34. Evaluation report of of all activities	A. ___ B. ___

35. Do you have clerical support?

A. Yes, 1 - 10 hours per week
B. Yes, 10 - 19 hours per week
C. Yes, 20 - 29 hours per week
D. Yes, 31 - 40 hours per week
E. No, I do not have clerical support

36. How frequently do you administer a Needs Assessment Survey?

A. Annually
B. Bi-annually
C. Every two years
D. Every three years
E. Needs have not been assessed on our campus

37. How was your assignment as Staff Development Coordinator determined?

A. I was recruited
B. The position was advertised and I applied
C. I was assigned the position
D. I was interviewed and selected
E. Other. Specify:_____

38. What is your length of assignment as Staff Development Coordinator?

A. 1 year B. 2 years C. 3 years D. Indefinitely

E. Other. Specify:_____

39. Are you responsible for staff development activities other than those funded by AB 1725?

A. Yes B. No <u>If yes</u>, please list:

_____

_____

_____

40. Does being the Staff Development Coordinator necessitate your being on additional committees? A. Yes B. No If yes, please list:

_____

_____

41. What staff development activity proved to be the greatest success on your campus last year? _____

_____

42. What activity was the least successful last year?

_____

_____

43. List 3 speakers or consultants that you highly recommend, including contact information for each of them.

1. **Speaker/Consultant's Name**: _____

Street Address: _____

City_____ State_____ Zip Code_____ Phone (___)_____

Topic(s): _____

_____

2. **Speaker/Consultant's Name**: _____

Street Address: _____

City_____ State_____ Zip Code_____ Phone (___)_____

Topic(s): _____

_____

3. **Speaker/Consultant's Name**: _____

Street Address: _____

City_____ State_____ Zip Code_____ Phone (___)_____

Topic(s): _____

_____

4C/SD is compiling information about the tangible outcomes of staff development programs. Questions 44-52 will assist us in the process.

44. Summarize the benefits of staff development as reported by <u>faculty</u>.

45. By what method(s) do faculty report these benefits?

46. Summarize the benefits of staff development reported by <u>classified staff</u>.

47. By what method(s) do classified staff report these benefits?

48. Summarize the benefits of staff development reported by managers.

49. By what method(s) do managers report these benefits?

50. Summarize the outcomes of your staff development program for student learning.

51. By what method(s) are these student outcomes determined?

52. Have you completed an annual review or evaluation of your 1991-92 staff development program?

A. Yes B. No

If yes, please attach a copy of the review/evaluation.

If no, when will the review be completed? _____

Please send a copy when completed.

Thanks again for your prompt response to this survey!

Return by Friday, October 2 to:

Sharon Ratliffe
Golden West College
15744 Golden West St.
Huntington Beach, CA 925647

Phone: (714) 895-8180
FAX: (714) 895-8243

Survey instrument designed by:

Avril Lovell, Rancho Santiago College
Sharon Ratliffe, Golden West College
Pat Toney-Anthony, Orange Coast College

8/90